

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-16 stand rejected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets," Applicants have amended the drawings to include the arc gap AG in Figure 5 and focal point F_1 , diameter of the illuminated zone D_1 and the diameter of the target D_{spot} in Figure 6. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended claim 12 to overcome these informalities. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fallahi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,406,462, hereinafter Fallahi) in view of Davenport et al.

(U.S. Pat. No. 5,343,367, hereinafter Davenport). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note independent claims 1, 6 and 16 include the limitation of “the walls of said body cause total internal reflection of light emitted from said source focal point to said target focal points.” In addition, independent claim 11 includes “a light source supported by said body at said source focal point, said walls causing total internal reflection of light emitted by said source to focus at said target focal points.” Applicants assert these features are not taught nor suggested by either Fallahi or Davenport.

Fallahi appears to disclose merely a solid collector having a rectangular cross section with a reflective coating on the reflector surface. Fallahi does not disclose, however, a solid body of revolution ellipsoid forming a total internal reflection of light as evidenced by the application of the cladding to the reflector. Davenport does not remedy the shortcomings of Fallahi. Davenport appears to disclose the use of facetized surfaces to enable total internal reflection and further uses these facetized surfaces to direct the light toward the output aperture. As neither Fallahi nor Davenport teach using “the walls of a body” to create total internal reflection as claimed in Applicants’ invention, Applicants submit independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, as claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15 depend from either independent claims 1, 6, 11 or 16, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 14, 2004

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/ps